

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/609,165	06/27/2003	Serge Julien Auguste Imhoff	DN2003076	7815	
27280 7:	590 04/25/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
THE GOODYEAR TIRE & RUBBER COMPANY			FISCHER, JUSTIN R		
	AL PROPERTY DEPART ARKET STREET	MENT 823	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
AKRON, OH 44316-0001			1733		
			DATE MAIL ED: 04/25/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action							
Before	the Filing of an Appeal Brief						

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/609,165	IMHOFF ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Justin R. Fischer	1733

	Examino.	, ,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
	Justin R. Fischer	1733				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 April 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.				
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)			
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be</li> </ol>	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)	), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.			
AMENDMENTS		e				
3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);						
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		educing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	-	jected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		omphant / thonamon	(1 102 02 1).			
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	· ———	, timely filed amendm	ent canceling			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-13 and 16-21. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			•			
11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  See Continuation Sheet.						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
•						

Continuation of 11: Independent claim 1 is analogous to previously drafted claim 15. Applicant argues that Boon does suggest the use of an epoxy treatment before or after twisting the yarns but fails to suggest such a treatment before AND after twisting the yarns. However, the claims as currently drafted fail to require such a limitation. The language "polyepoxide adhesion activator" does not require a polyepoxide material as the activator is included in combination with an aqueous emulsion comprising a polyepoxide. As such, the spin finish emulsion of Boon can be viewed as a "polyepoxide adhesion activator" since it is included with an aqueous emulsion comprising a polyepoxide.

Lastly, applicant contends that a comparison of Samples 1 and 2 provides a showing of unexpected results. However, the respective samples differ in reinforcing material (PEN vs. PET) and cord treatment and as such, it is unclear if the benefits should be attributed to the reinforcing material and/or the particular cord treatments.

Justin Fischer

April 24, 2006